

Church Union News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee
of the
South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. I

MAY 1931

No. 6

CONTENTS

1. EDITORIALS

	PAGE
PRESBYTERIAN AND CONGREGATIONAL ELEMENTS ...	211
FELLOWSHIP WITH FREE CHURCHES	212
THE REPORT OF THE CONGREGATIONAL COMMISSION ...	212

2. ARTICLES

THE POSITION AND WORK OF A BISHOP	213
THE LIVING CHURCH: ITS UNITY	217
WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH IN SOUTH INDIA ...	225
REPORT OF JOINT COMMISSION ON CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA <i>L.M.S.</i>	231
RESOLUTIONS OF THE MADRAS CHURCH COUNCIL OF THE S. I. U. C. WITH REFERENCE TO UNION... ..	240
CHURCH UNION - <i>R.C. & Anglo-Indian</i>	241
LAMBETH AND THE NINTH SESSION	242

3. CLIPPINGS

CHRIST AND THE CHURCH	246
------------------------------	-----

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras

1931

The Christian Literature Society for India

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras



Books on Church Union in South India

IN ENGLISH

Price
Rs A

THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION (Revised Edition)

Prepared by the Joint Committee on Union .. 0 6

CHURCH UNION—An Indian View.

By Dr. A. J. Appasamy 0 4

CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA—The Story of the Negotiations.

By the Bishop of Madras—S. P. C. K. .. 1 8

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM—A survey of the present position.

Edited by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E, LL.D.—CASSELL. 5 0

LAUSANNE, LAMBETH AND SOUTH INDIA—Notes on the present position of the Reunion Movement.

By N. P. Williams, D.D.—S. P. C. K. .. 1 14

IN TAMIL

SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED—Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union .. 0 4

IN TELUGU

SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED—Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union ... 0 4

SPECIAL INTERCESSION AND PRAYERS FOR UNITY

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs 2-8-0 per 100

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS REV. J. S. M. HOOPER, M.A.

REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D.

(*Managing Editor.*)

Publishers

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

Vol. I

MAY 1931

No. 6

Editorials

Presbyterian and Congregational Elements

Reference is so often made to the desirability of including the Episcopal Presbyterian, and Congregational elements in any attempt at union, and with this there is so often coupled the criticism that, in the South India Scheme, Episcopacy looms so large that the others are lost sight of, that it becomes necessary to call attention to the facts that the very heart of the Presbyterian system has been adopted in that Councils of ministers and laymen are an essential part of the Scheme. No bishop can control any section of the Church. He is not only bound by the Constitution but he must work in harmony with his Council or he cannot work at all. It is true the word *presbytery* is not used but the essential fact is there in a council that has ample authority to deal with all matters in the Church.

Likewise the local congregation is provided for in the Constitution and will have abundant powers with reference to its local affairs. It is probably not known to all to what extent the local congregation now enjoys autonomy in the Church of England, but when one reads about advowsons

and the difficulties between bishops and congregations that want certain types of worship, one realizes that the bishop in that Church does not even now have things his own way. Much more so in the South India Scheme there will be a large place for the local congregation, but it should always be in harmony with the whole Church.

Fellowship with Free Churches

Some seem to fear that after thirty years the united Church in South India will become an exclusive, isolated Episcopal Church, in communion only with Episcopal Churches. Any such condition would be contrary to the Scheme as now formulated. The provision for inter-communion with Free Churches will not come up for consideration after thirty years, but is part of the permanent provision of the Scheme. Only a deliberate act of the Church after union, or similarly a deliberate act on the part of some other Church could sever the relationship that would exist between them, and such an act is absolutely outside the realm of possibility in this age. We know of no Church that during the past generation has declared itself out of communion with any other Church. The whole fellowship of inter-communion is a constantly growing relationship quite apart from official acts of Churches. Another generation during which this movement continues ought to see all barriers removed. Hence there is no danger of exclusiveness, but every hope and assurance of much wider fellowships.

The Report of the Congregational Commission

We are publishing herewith the report that has been adopted by the Joint Commission appointed by the London Missionary Society, Congregational Union of England and Wales, Congregational Union of Scotland, and the Union of Scotland, and the Union of Welsh Independents.

The contents of the document fully explain its nature. One thing, however, should be remembered in connection with this report, and that is that this document goes to the London Missionary Society, and that the Directors of that Society will issue a statement to their Missions in India on the basis thereof. That statement has not yet been received and consequently nothing can be said with reference to it. But it was thought well to place this document before all our readers as soon as possible in order that they might be able to form opinions with reference to it. We welcome so broad a statement on the basis of the Fundamental Principle of the London Missionary Society and commend this document to the earnest study of all those connected with the Church Union Movement in South India.

Articles

The Position and Work of a Bishop

In writing of the Position and Work of a Bishop I do not propose to deal with the theory of the Episcopate, or to discuss such questions as that of the Apostolic Succession. My purpose is rather to describe as simply and frankly as I can how, after six years' work as a Bishop, I have come to regard my position and the work which has been entrusted to me.

First of all I want to say that a Bishop is conscious that he is more than just an official. In common with every Minister in Christ's Church he is conscious that he has received a commission, not from man, but from our Lord himself. He would never have dared to accept the Office of Bishop, if he had not firmly believed that it was our Lord Himself who was laying it upon him. The first question which was put to him at his Consecration was, 'Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this Ministration according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ?' When he answered, 'I am so persuaded,' he was bearing public testimony to the fact that he believed that he had heard in his own heart that same charge which our Blessed Lord first gave to Saint Peter by the lakeside, 'Feed My lambs; tend My sheep.' But then, what does that charge imply? It is more than a commission to perform certain official duties. It is a personal appeal to enter into certain personal relations with others. When the Lord Jesus first gave that charge, which He still gives to every Minister whom He calls, He was about to leave the scene of His earthly Ministry, and was preparing to hand over to others much of the work which He had hitherto done. He was no longer to be seen by His little flock. Many others were soon to be gathered into that flock who would never have seen Him or known Him in the flesh. Of course, no one else ever could be to a faithful Disciple just what the Lord Jesus Himself had been; and indeed, though He was no longer to be visible to His Disciples, yet was still going to be to all who believed on Him much of what He had been to the Disciples when He wandered with them in Galilee, and in some respects even more. But the lambs, the little ones; and the sheep, so many of them foolish, ignorant, and liable to stray; did they not need someone whom they could see and hear to shepherd and guide and feed them? They would not all be strong enough to live by faith alone, unaided by sight and sound of voice. So the Lord, before He departs, gives this charge to feed and tend His sheep. In effect He says, 'I, the Great Shepherd, am now going away out of sight; and therefore you must care for the sheep, and must try to be something at least to them of what I have always been to you.'

Now, it is this personal element upon which I wished to insist, as being the heart and soul of a Bishop's work, as it must be of every true Minister's work in the Church of Christ. Unless this is put a long way first, neither he nor anyone else can have a proper idea of his position and work. A Bishop is called, not so much to do something, as to be someone. Of course, he has his official duties to perform; he has his work to do. But however well and faithfully he performs those duties, he will not be achieving what is required of him, unless he is first and foremost a shepherd with a shepherd's heart; no, that is inadequate, with *the Shepherd's Heart*. 'Lovest thou me? Feed My sheep.' Love Me; feed on Me, the Living Bread; and then, and only then, will you have wherewith to feed the sheep. It is a most intimate personal bond; and that is the heart and soul of it all.

I believe it to be most important to insist upon this personal element; because there is nothing more subversive of the whole idea of the Church of Christ than to regard Bishops or any other Ministers as merely officials. The Church is not just a human organization like the State. It is a Family; nay more, it is a Body. In the State the officials are officials and nothing more; and it is sought to keep the State in health and peace by a nice adjustment of rights and privileges. But the health of the Church, of the Body of Christ, does not depend upon the claiming and granting of rights; it depends upon the functioning of the bond of love. Therefore Ministers of the Church are not just to exercise authority and to be obeyed as officers; they are to love and be loved as fathers. This is where the Church is so immeasurably superior to the State. You can speak of the State as a body; but then you are only using a metaphor. The Church really is a Body, a living Body. And this is nowhere more evident than in the relations which should subsist between its officials and the people under their charge. There can be a health and a harmony in the life of the Church which is only to be found in the life of a State at rare intervals and on abnormal occasions, just because the Ministers are not merely officials, but are 'fathers in God' bound to those whom they control by the true bond of love which belongs only to a living body. 'Obey them which rule over you, and submit to them: for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief: for this were unprofitable for you.' (Heb. xiii. 17). And behind it all is the will of the living, loving Jesus, the Great Shepherd of the sheep, who gave such gifts to His Church; 'some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the Body of Christ.' (Eph. iv. 11-12).

To sum up, then, what we have to say of the position of a Bishop: we shall say that he must be a shepherd and a father first; and only

next an official. He cannot be an efficient official, unless he is a true father, loving and beloved. He has authority, and he has to exercise it; but he only can truly exercise it, and it is only meant to be exercised, as the unquestioned authority of a father. No doubt, it is necessary in this imperfect world to safeguard the rights of the people and to limit the power of the Bishop; but the Bishop himself knows well enough that, just in proportion as he and his flock become *conscious* of these safeguards and limitations and of their operation, so is he failing to be what he really should be to his people. That is why, whatever theory we may hold of the meaning and authority of the episcopate, we may be sure that we have not got the thing rightly expressed in our Constitution, if that Constitution treats the Bishops only as officials and does not somehow express the idea that they are first and foremost gifts of the Lord Christ to His Church, bearing a personal commission from Himself to feed and tend the flock, and endowed by Him for that purpose with special gifts of grace which are meant to have their due scope and function in the life of the whole Body.

But now let us proceed to consider the actual work of a Bishop in the light of the principles which we have laid down. How will he in his everyday work bring into play this personal element which we have said must count for so much? In answering this I shall be describing what occupies fully nine-tenths of my time and thought; for only one-tenth of me is an official; the rest of me is occupied in trying to be a shepherd and a father.

First of all, he must be a father, and thus try to make his Diocese a real family. He must strive to be as far as he can, as the Lord Jesus was to the first band of Disciples, a personal centre and rallying point for the whole Diocese. He must set himself to be, as far as he may, such, in his conduct and temper, as will cause the Clergy first, and then the Laity, to give him their confidence, and to make them turn naturally to him to find by his help the solution of the problems with which they may be faced from time to time, in the terms of loyalty to the whole body. This is a most important point. One of the great objects of Diocesan organization is to deliver individual congregations from narrow parochialism; just as Dioceses in their turn are organized into a Province that they too may not suffer from similar narrowness of life and outlook. Every Bishop finds that it takes all the time and influence that he is able to spare to combat this narrowness. It cannot be adequately counted by conciliar organization alone or by any such means. It requires the personal factor of one who is known and felt to have the interests of all equally at heart; who is felt to be for all and to belong to all; who by virtue of his very position can only be what he ought to be if he has the love and loyalty of all, a love and loyalty which finds expression in unity of spirit. This factor the Bishop

has to supply; and his ability to supply it depends upon his personal relations with congregations and individuals throughout his Diocese.

Then we must put second in his work his personal acquaintance with and care of the Clergy in the Diocese. Happy is the Bishop whose Diocese is of such a size that it is possible for him to spare a month every year for the work of sitting down in one place and simply giving himself up to the training of those whom he is about to ordain. If he can do this, then he has the chance of establishing relations with his Ordinands which will endure throughout their ministry, and will make all the difference to their work and to the Bishop's dealings with them. But equally important is the care of the Clergy after they have been ordained. They are often very lonely in their work; and often, alas, they have to suffer much trouble from their congregations. They have indeed the inexpressible comfort of knowing that their Lord is always standing by them. But faith does sometimes grow dim; and we are all of us weak; and so the Bishop has a real part to play in making the Clergy feel that there is at least one human being at hand who is ready to try to understand and sympathize and help to the utmost of his power. Let it further be confessed that the Clergy do not always stand by one another as they should. Here too it is of great value that there should be someone like the Bishop who is known to make every Minister's cause his own; who trusts and honours and cares for all alike; who takes it as a betrayal and wounding of himself if one Minister lets down another. Then again, what a difference it can make to the work of the Clergy, if the Bishop can be a real father in Christ to them! Every Minister must feed and tend the sheep for the love of Christ; his work will be barren and worthless enough if that love is not the motive of it. But surely the Bishop may, without presumption, seek to reinforce this loyalty to the Chief Shepherd by an additional loyalty to himself. It is an inspiration and a help to the Minister to know that the Bishop takes a personal pride and pleasure in good work done by him; that the Bishop cares for and prays for that portion of the flock to which he ministers; and that, if by his neglect that part of the flock should suffer, then the Bishop will feel that he has let him down.

This leads on to the third and last part of the Bishop's work which I shall mention. It is the work of knowing the sheep by name. 'He calleth his own sheep by name.' The Diocese can only be a family if the father knows his children. It is just this personal touch with individual members of the Diocese which enables them to enter into and live the family life of the whole Diocese. This, incidentally, determines the size of an ideal Diocese. It should not be so large that the Bishop cannot hope to be known (and God grant that he may be loved and trusted!) in every parish. It will indeed take all his time and strength, and will involve continual travelling; but it is what the Bishop must aim at. In his ministry

of Confirmation the Bishop has an excellent means of striving to come somewhere near to the realization of this ideal. It is indeed a misfortune that most Dioceses are so large that the Bishop can usually only confirm all the candidates, who are to be presented to him in the course of the year, by calling them in to various centres; and then has no time for personal intercourse with them. But in a Diocese of the right size this need not be so. I am one of the fortunate ones who have a Diocese of reasonable size; and it is the exception for me to confirm any but school children save in their own villages; and in far the larger number of cases, I know the Christian name of each candidate and can pronounce it without being prompted at the time of laying my hand upon his head. In the last sentence I excepted school children. They are generally congregated in such numbers that the Bishop cannot hope to know them personally. But the Bishop is meant, whenever possible, to be in real touch with the life of the schools and other such institutions in his Diocese. If he cannot know the children, he can try to know the teachers; and any time which he can spare for visiting schools and getting to know the staff and giving them addresses will be well worth while. It all helps to make the Diocese one family.

Who is sufficient for these things? Who indeed? In the midst of all our failures and shortcomings we are constantly turning again to the Master who called us to this work; and He always asks us the same question, 'Lovest thou Me?' And that question makes each failure an occasion for learning once again that the most important work of all must be that of communion with the Lord and intercession for others; and that we have no position or standing at all unless we are in living touch with Him who said, 'Apart from Me ye can do nothing.'

April, 1931. PHILIP NASIK.

(An Address delivered at Bournemouth, in July 1930)

The Living Church: Its Unity

By THE REV. J. VERNON BARTLET, D.D., OXFORD, ENGLAND

Our subject to-day is the Unity of the Churches as a 'living' society, a society pulsing with a life proper to its nature, and thus having within itself power to play the part assigned to it in the great world-plan of God for humanity. If, however, we are to see this special aspect of our general topic of conference with sure and clear vision, we must view it consciously in its true perspective as part of a whole.

We have already considered the authority of the Living Church or Divine Society, and found it to consist essentially in its gospel, the intrinsic truth and power of its glad message of a gracious, heavenly Father, entrusted to it to live by, and by living it out, to become its primary witness,

So Dr. P. T. Forsyth had already argued in a memorable utterance at the Boston Council of 1899. But, as he too recognized, the authority or moral sovereignty of that message consists further in its being the continuation and extension of the life-witness, in word and deed, of 'the true and faithful witness,' Jesus Christ, the fountainhead alike of the Church's special life and witness. By shedding His life-blood for the fulfilment of His vocation, as given by the Heavenly Father, He both sealed His own witness and gave it redemptive power for men, through the distinctive quality of His personality, as at once representative Son of Man and archetypal Son of God. Thus having become potentially Lord and Head of a renewed humanity, Christ became forthwith Lord and Head of the Church, God's special society within humanity. Through it, as the embodiment of its Head's distinctive spirit or life, the complete renewal of humanity is in process of realization by the energy of the Spirit of God, now active with new efficacy, both within and without the Church, in virtue of Christ's historical person and work.

If, then, the Church is to function as a living power and fulfil its divine destiny, this will be in the exact measure in which it has living relations with its Head, through whom it draws from God, the Father of man's personal spirit, its vital resources, both for itself and for its part in the redemptive work of grace in all men. In other words, the Church is distinctively the Society of the Christlike; and inasmuch as the quality most distinctive of Christ, its Head, is love—in the new Christian sense, of which His historic personality is the one adequate revelation—the most exact synonym for 'a Living Church' is 'a loving Church.' Let me repeat it, for it has been sadly obscured by the Church's history, both past and present, and yet is of elemental importance: the Church, as Christ meant it to be, is 'living' just in so far as it is 'loving,' as He was and is loving. In so far as it is otherwise, it has only 'a name to live, but is dead,' as His Church, whatever its ecclesiastical or institutional status of constitution, whether as regards sacraments, ministry, creed, cultus, or other forms of its organized being. 'By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye love one another.' For 'God is love'; and men, as redeemed by being lifted, through death, to their native egoism (determined by their physical and psychical past), on to a new and morally supernatural plane corresponding to the creative idea of manhood (symbolized by the story in Genesis), are made actual 'partakers of the divine nature' as children of love.

But such love is not, as is so commonly assumed, a thing beyond moral control, and therefore no proper subject for divine command to all, as Christ implies it is. Rather is it the natural reaction of man's emotional nature to the supernatural gospel of the Fatherly Grace of God, revealed to the uttermost of self-giving for man in the Cross of Christ. It answers to the gospel's new valuation of man, as an idea fit to be the object of God's

marvellous redemptive love. Thus the love of the true Church of Christ is inspired love, 'the love of God' for personality as latent in man, and is 'shed abroad' in believing human hearts 'by His Spirit.' Therein lay and still lies the promise and potency of a world-wide revaluation of all man's existing values touching both himself and his fellows, of whatever estate or condition. It is virtue of this, and this alone, that the gospel is the one final world-religion. In this light manhood first stood forth as, in God's purpose and provision, sacred, worthy of awful reverence for his Maker's and Redeemer's sake, and with a new meaning of transcendence amid the sum of things we call the universe. Relative to such a being 'brotherhood,' as the correlative of divine Fatherhood revealed in grace, gained a fresh depth of meaning and sincerity.

It remains still to mention one other outcome of all this, perhaps the most important of all for the basis of Church unity: I mean reverence for Christian conscience touching God's will in Christ. This rules out all coercion by the Church, of conscience in its members, whether severally or in organized groups, as a method for attaining unity. This principle was first set forth by St. Paul in his classic plea for mutual consideration of conscience in Rom. xiv. Christians in saving relation to the Church's Head are to be 'received' in full communion, apart from differing views as to such applications of that relation in practice as are not made clear by the Word of His gospel. As examples of such doubtful points Paul specifies the observance of certain sacred days—Sabbath, Sunday, or other—according to current ideas of a hallowed day, and the use or non-use of certain foods held by many to be religiously defiling. Obedience here to the will of the Lord was held by some to commend the believer to his Master, and so far to qualify him for Churchmanship; while lack here had the opposite and disqualifying effect. In so thinking they were guided by pre-Christian prejudices, particularly of the Jewish order. How besetting these could be, is shown by the fact that St. Peter and Barnabas for a time were swayed by them to deny full Church fellowship to uncircumcised believers in Christ (Gal. ii.). Indeed it seems that only Paul's superior insight saved the Apostolic Church from actual schism into two parts, viewed by one, if not both of them, as on different levels of acceptance with God. There was indeed an extreme section of the original or non-Pauline type which even denied to the other type of believers in Christ any such acceptance, and therefore any part or lot in His salvation. This latter position answers to the Roman Catholic attitude to-day, while the former anticipates the Anglo-Catholic one towards non-episcopal Communions.

Against all this, Paul lays down the principle that such differences ought not to be a ground of mutual judgment between Christians: they were matters for each man's conscience towards the Lord Himself, in a sphere of liberty where each could be condemned only by his own act, *i.e.*, by

adopting an attitude about which he himself had doubts. For 'whatsoever is not of faith,' in the sense of conviction as to the Lord's will, 'is sin' to him who does it. This principle Paul finally carried to victory in the council of leaders at Jerusalem, which resulted in a temporary concordat on that basis, one which recognized the manifest tokens of God's Spirit at work among both types of Christians as decisive for Church status. This settled for all time the master-principle of Church unity. It is just a corollary of the very idea of Church fellowship, *viz.*, Christian love, which looks not only to its own things, even the things of conscience, but considers also the conscience of others, and shrinks from insisting on freedom for one's own conscience at the price of grieving or weakening the conscience of a brother needlessly. Let there be no mistake about it: Church unity must rest on brotherly love as its one basic principle. But Christian love implies liberty of conscience on both sides, as before the same Lord. Apart from this in practice, to speak of Christian love is self-delusion. And it is on these twin principles, so far-reaching as in fact to cover all that divides Christians to-day into different Communions, that I would now concentrate attention, and sketch out some of their practical applications to the present situation.

In so saying, however, I do not forget that some would deny the relevance of the analogy of the situation either in Acts xv. or in Rom. xiv. to our own, which turns on the relations of Catholicism and Protestantism as age-long, historic bodies of Church principles. Accordingly they would deny also that the principles just cited bear on the present case at all. For the matter of ministerial order, as conditioning the grace of the sacrament of Holy Communion, is in fact held by consistent 'Catholics' of all types to be an integral part of the very gospel itself, so far as this contemplates the Christian salvation as the life of a society of an institutional type, determined by divine constitution or law. Here lies the real *crux* of the whole matter, *viz.*, in the legal element still persisting, according to Catholics, in the gospel, under the form of a divine ritual directly resting on commission from the Church's Head, for the authorized appointment of its ministry, both for Word (in the complete sense) and sacraments. Divine Law, it is urged, warrants the method of moral coercion, by the denial of Church fellowship to those who by their own choice are without the said sole legitimate ritual; upon which depends, in turn, an assured share in the grace, at least in its fullness, of the chief form of Church fellowship with the Head and His members.

To those who thus think, the deepest life of a living Church is bound up by divine decree with 'apostolic succession,' not so much in the apostolic gospel as in apostolic orders, as qualifying for its full and sacramental ministry. Truly an astounding proposition for one judging simply by the apostolic writings, and particularly those of St. Paul, to whose intervention

the Church Catholic, whether in the technical or the wider sense, historically owes its very being as more than a second-class appendage of proselytes to the divine Israel of God, on its originally Jewish-Christian basis. In those writings there is no explicit or indubitable assertion of any such exclusive grace of apostolic orders, as possessed by themselves for the administration of the Holy Communion, and still as transmissible to any other body of men. The very idea of transmission of any such commission was absent from the thought of the Apostolic Age, if only for the simple reason that no succeeding age was looked for, in view of the expected bodily return of Christ within the first generation of the Church's life. The whole Catholic notion in the matter is thus a pure anachronism. But if so, the matter must remain for us all one of 'doubtful disputation'—in St. Paul's language in Rom. xiv.—for the Christian conscience, save on the *a priori* hypothesis of Church tradition as infallible in its interpretation of what was originally entrusted to it by the apostles, whether in the abiding form of written words or in the changeable form of oral teaching. This is the logically consistent theory of Romanism; and it alone can bear the weight of the exclusive claims which other types of Catholicism would fain build on their basal principles.

I repeat, then, that the Christian conscience cannot, under a non-legal gospel such as Paul championed, rightly be confronted with episcopacy as indispensable before God, or 'in the court of conscience,' to normal Church fellowship or the grace of any Christian sacrament. That episcopacy is for practical purposes indispensable for our realizing, within any time that the human mind to-day can forecast, that working Church unity among Christians of a world-wide or Catholic kind which is now felt to be so needful, is a very different proposition. It is one of which I myself am deeply convinced as a matter of the higher expediency, in the interests of the whole Church and its work in the world. But the adoption of episcopacy on that basis must come about for reasons manifestly integral to the essential spirit of the gospel, as a gospel of mutual love between the members, not of a divine State or polity; but of God's 'family of faith.' The morally coercive method of Catholicism, in trying to impose on all consciences its own theory as to the nature of episcopacy, is alien to the very spirit of Christ, which here is surely self-evidencing to all Christians as such.

But in fact the great Lambeth Appeal of 1920 carried us far beyond the point of the traditional 'Catholic' estimate of the Christian character and value of the non-episcopal Communion, to which, among others, it addressed its fresh call to unity. That appeal was on a basis not excluding but explicitly, and even thankfully, including the recognition of diversity of gifts of insight and of earnest endeavour to embody what of the full and richly variegated wisdom of God, contained in reserve for all, each Communion had been able to receive, in trust not only for its own children

but also for the whole Body of Christ. Of that one Church each Christian Communion, in spite of external division, still remains a living part. The fact that it has proved so hard for the Bishops who issued that Appeal for 'unity in diversity,' and a diverse rather than uniform unity, to act up to the level of the vision of fellowship in Christ's one Church which lay behind that Appeal, only shows more clearly how truly inspired of God was that historically unique appeal. I for one cannot doubt that it was not only epoch-marking but also epoch-making. Things can never be as before, between us and the Anglican Communion. For those who responded in any real sense, the old sharp antithesis of Catholic and Protestant has gone for ever. Evangelic Catholicism and Catholic Evangelicalism have begun surely, however gradually, to replace them; and practical results for unity are bound to follow. Inter-communion must come, and that before very long, in some form or other. Already we have the most important acknowledgement, made by an official Anglican Committee of Bishops and other divines, that certain non-episcopal ministries are true ministries of the Word and sacraments within the one Church of Christ.

Another result of a more immediately practical kind is the South Indian Scheme of Reunion, whatever its exact issue in the near future. That depends not a little on the Lambeth Conference just about to meet, and to a real, if less degree, upon ourselves and those whom we here more or less represent.

Yet another was the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order of 1927, when seen in its true light and perspective, as met simply to take stock of the existing situation as regards actual differences of conception and the degree of unity in underlying ideas tending to draw all together, and thereby to learn how to surmount those differences as barriers to religious inter-communion and so to full co-operation in the work of the Kingdom of God at large, on the lines of the Life and Work Conference of 1925 at Stockholm, and face to face with other religions. On the basic subject of the gospel, those met at Lausanne, including even the Oriental Churches which take their stand on orthodoxy of creed and customs, found themselves in essential unity and were able to frame an agreed report as to the Church's message—an unparalleled thing, and one surely of momentous import for the future. Thus the *ultimate* basis of unity was already recognized as already laid of God Himself in the heart of the various Communions, a fact which the Papal type of Catholicism denies in principle. Thus a new type of Evangelic Catholicism or Catholic Evangelicism stood forth confessed to the whole world, on the one foundation of which St. Paul spoke long ago. This is none other than Christ Himself as 'clothed in His gospel' savingly experienced—to use the historic phrase of the most truly catholic-minded of the Fathers of the great Reformation, Philip Melancthon.

It is true that when we passed—I speak as one who was there and breathed the wonderful spirit of unity in Christ felt by all in that unique assemblage—to formulate our conceptions of the concrete institutions in which the gospel has come to be embodied in our several theologies and Church practices, difference clearly emerged at certain points: yet, be it noted, it was difference in reflective or intellectual conceptions of the understanding, rather than in intuitive perceptions of the ideas and values of Church creed, ministry, sacraments. To the positive meaning and worth of these for us all we gladly made confession, distinguishing the *how* from the *what* of the grace involved in each, as the gift of God to His Church. Thus even here the note of unity was very marked, though by some—the extremists on both sides, *i.e.*, those hankering most after intellectual agreement on the guarantee of like spiritual institutions in living experience—the differences were felt yet more.

So much, then, for the present situation. What emerges from it as to the future basis of unity is to my mind quite clear: the one possible basis is *comprehension on principle*, to be attained by way of conviction or 'faith' in it as God's will and way for us, and without the pressure of moral coercion of conscience in any by the conscience of any. That is the golden rule of the Lambeth Appeal, *viz.*, 'God wills fellowship' only through mutual consideration of conscience, in its positive aspect, namely as holding certain distinctive points of emphasis in trust for the whole Church of God. Thus the road to greater unity is that of spiritual enlargement of sympathy, and of the insight which goes along with it. *Amplius* should be our watchword all round: let us learn what others have that we have been largely blind to. Thus, we Congregationalists, while we are, as Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson in *Foundations* handsomely recognizes, perhaps the most catholic-minded of all denominations, owing to our having no Church idea in the 'connexional' sense (including Anglicanism), to compete with the idea of the One Church in the absolute or all-inclusive sense, have yet much that is precious in practice to learn from the traditional or historical type of the episcopate common to Catholics at large. It has been, and may be on a larger scale in the future, the effective symbol of solidarity throughout the Church in its organized or visible aspect, giving largeness of outlook and feeling for that Church both in time and space, in its continuity and in its capacity for organized unity of action. We have only to remember the Lambeth Conference of Bishops, as the responsible, normal, ganglionic centres of organic unity over large parts of the Church's being as the Body of Christ in this visible, concrete world, meeting together to realize and express the corporate mind of their Communion; and then compare ourselves here met as a council of delegates *ad hoc*, meeting for a week and then relapsing into our several varying contexts of Church life and

experience. Surely the difference springs to the mind's eye. Their solidarity too we ought to have, and yet so as not to undo or forgo what of distinctive value our emphasis on the local unit of the One Church's life of and for fellowship has given us.

Need I say that the episcopate which I contemplate, and ask you to contemplate, as likely to be one day a great co-ordinating and unifying factor in a Living Church of the future more adequate than it is now, alike to the Church idea and to the function entrusted to it in God's world-purpose for mankind, is not the historic episcopate just as it is or as it has been for most of its long history? Rather is it one modified as regards its self-sufficiency, and too often autocracy, by the complementary forms of Church organization for which Presbyterianism and Congregationalism have stood historically, and the value of which is recognized in the Lambeth Appeal. This, which is what is meant by the phrase a 'constitutional episcopate,' is the type both contemplated and embodied in principle by the South Indian Scheme. In order, however, to secure such comprehension of differences in the unity of the Gospel of Christ, savingly experienced and evidenced by the fruits of the Spirit, the inclusion of elements hitherto distinctive of Catholic and Protestants must be largely on a persuasive, not a compulsory or uniform basis. The Spirit of Jesus cannot be at home with or make terms with compulsion; such was the testimony of our Separatist Congregational forefathers, and of the later varieties of the same type known as Baptists, Friends, as well as certain other more modern forms such as the Disciples in the U.S.A. This, too, broadly speaking, is the most striking and hopeful feature of the South Indian Scheme, which is therefore a genuine Christian concordat. Christian liberty, on the basis of love for conscience in all, is its key; and without this there can be no real advance in unity. Those Anglo-Catholics who refuse such liberty on principle have no proper part and lot in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, and no rôle to play in the future of Anglicanism as a Bridge Church. It has been such already, in its own past and present union of differences; and, please God, it may afford an object-lesson and concrete basis for boundless possibilities of yet wider and more conscious developments of the principle set forth so persuasively, and in so Christian a spirit, in its Appeal of 1920.

Let us go back to this and study it afresh, while the present Lambeth Conference is in session on the most responsible task of applying its root-principles yet further to concrete conditions, particularly *apropos* of the South India Scheme. Let us associate ourselves with that sister Conference in prayer and in every way open to us, with a view to its attaining the height of its opportunity, to the greater glory of God and the fuller blessing of mankind in and through the Church of His beloved Son, their Saviour Lord and ours.

Wesleyan Methodist Church in South India

By C. H. MONAHAN

Methodist Missions in the East were founded by Thomas Coke, friend of John Wesley and ardent Evangelist, characterized by a British officer as 'the holiest little devil' he had ever met. Yet Coke never set foot in India. As he was bringing a band of six young missionaries, he died on the voyage and was buried at sea. His companions after many privations reached Ceylon where work was begun in 1814. One of them, James Lynch, who was stationed at Jaffna, was invited by some Methodist soldiers in Fort St. George to visit Madras which he did in 1817. Similar invitations led the missionaries at various times to open work in Trichinopoly, Bangalore, Seringapatam, Secunderabad and elsewhere. This led to an undue emphasis on English work in the first decades of the Mission. Moreover the wide dispersion of the small staff made concentration impossible. The want of a well-thought out policy agreed upon between the Home authorities and the men on the field militated against their success. By the middle of the nineteenth century it could not be said that they had made any serious impression on Hindus. Very gifted men like Elijah Hoole, G. U. Pope and William Arthur were sent out as missionaries. Hoole did much itinerant evangelism in Tamil, in which language he was an excellent scholar, but that type of touring did not lead to the building of the Church. Pope was an even greater scholar but his service was soon transferred to the S.P.G. William Arthur, well-known as the author of *The Tongue of Fire*, broke down in health after a very short stay in India, but by his '*Mission to the Mysore*' he showed with what ability and insight he had made himself ready to work amongst the people of that country. On the whole the first thirty years of the Mission were a time of discouragement except for the success among English-speaking people. The second line of advance was towards the caste people and was made principally through secondary schools. Thomas Hodson, who doubtless had been influenced by Duff in Calcutta, opened such a school in Bangalore in the thirties. It was probably Anderson's influence in Madras that led to the starting of a similar school in Royapettah in 1851, called then the Jenkins' School after Dr. Jenkins, who from 1846 to 1864 was a prominent figure in Madras missionary life. That school has developed into Wesley College. Another such school was opened in Negapatam and one of its first teachers was a great missionary, W. O. Simpson, warm-hearted, broad-minded, deeply spiritual and full of evangelistic zeal. Through his influence in the school, a Brahman youth by name N. Subrahmanyam was converted in 1858. He afterwards became the Administrator-General and founded the Kalyani

Hospital in memory of his mother fifty years after his conversion. Every task Simpson undertook succeeded. As preacher in English and in Tamil and as teacher he had the art of winning men. Before he left India on furlough after ten years of fruitful toil, he called attention to the fact that up to that time the Mission had appealed to English-speaking people and caste Hindus but had not gone after the outcastes in any worthy fashion. His wife's illness prevented him from returning to India though his boxes were packed for the voyage, for his heart was in this work. But his policy came to fruition in the career of William Burgess who arrived in India in the sixties. He was a 'demon for work' and had a gift in speech which led his hearers to decision. Whether in preaching to an English-speaking congregation in Georgetown or teaching students in Royapettah, he won decisions for Christ. Quite a number of caste Hindu youths in Royapettah were baptized and such was the rage of the infuriated relatives that Burgess' life was in danger. His appeal to caste Hindus had been, for their friends, too successful. The school was almost wrecked and Burgess who had earned a rest by ten years of eager service was sent home on furlough. Just as the bitterness of caste feeling had driven St. Paul to turn from his Jewish countrymen to the Gentile, so the tyranny of caste drove Burgess out in a mission to the outcaste which has changed the whole outlook of our work in South India. He returned from furlough 'burning with zeal' and was at once set to train a band of young converts for Christian service. With his students he preached in the villages and during the great famine of 1877 saved the lives of many. He was the first missionary to start work in Ikkadu where he baptized several families of Pariahs in 1878. In a village two miles from Ikkadu he also baptized a large number and similarly in the village of Arcot Kuppam. It is therefore true that in the Madras District of our Mission he blazed the trail into the field that has been so fruitful of results amongst the outcaste people. Very soon after these accessions he was drawn away to a wider field in Hyderabad of which more later. He had only made the beginning. George Mackenzie Cobban followed up his work and reached several new villages before illness compelled him to return home in 1892. Meanwhile William Goudie had in 1888 taken up his abode in Ikkadu and for eighteen years was the champion of the rights of the outcaste. In Ikkadu and the neighbouring town of Tiruvallur he founded a group of Mission institutions which prove the catholicity of his conception of the Gospel. A hospital, and dispensary, two boarding schools, a lace hall, and a Church in Ikkadu, and in Tiruvallur a High School and a school for little Hindu girls were built by his efforts. Meanwhile he brought the Gospel to scores of villages in the Chingleput, N. Arcot and Chittoor districts. Ikkadu has become a hive of Mission industry, known throughout the Presidency by its attractive

products. It is in some respects a model Mission station. It certainly embodies the principles of success so lacking in the earliest days of our Mission in South India. There is concentration, continuity and co-ordination of activities. It may be said that from the time when Burgess made a break into work for the outcastes, the days of discouragement passed. The last fifty years have seen very great progress in many directions. The appeal to the English-speaking people has been maintained, and the appeal to the caste Hindus has not ceased through higher education, medical work and industrial service, but until a few years ago the mass movement was almost entirely among the Pariahs of the Chingleput, Chittoor and Coimbatore districts and amongst the Malas and Madigas of the Nizam's Dominions.*

For long years the Trichinopoly District showed no great accessions. In Negapatam the High School was carried on by a series of able missionaries of whom W. H. Findlay was the most gifted. He raised the school to the grade of a College. After a few years it was transferred to Mannargudi. It is now a first-grade College named after him 'Findlay College'. Some striking conversions have taken place in that institution. In 1892 Theophilus Subrahmanyam, once a student of our School in Mannargudi, was baptized. He has for many years been a minister of our Church and a preacher to Hindus of no ordinary quality. Another minister, Paul S. Rangaramanujam, was won for Christ when J. J. Ellis was on the staff of Findlay College. Through his influence other young men were also won. When their Baptism took place Ellis had an experience very similar to that of Burgess. The fury of the caste spirit blazed high against him and made it impossible for him to remain in Mannargudi. Like St. Paul he too had to turn to the 'Gentiles'. He found his sphere among the Pariahs of the Konganad in the Coimbatore District, where the way had been prepared by the labours of older missionaries. A mass movement followed and is still in progress. The Trichinopoly District of our Mission is no longer a barren field. Several thousands have of recent years been received into the Christian fold in the area of that district.

It will be convenient now to take up Burgess' story at the year 1878. In that year he and Henry Little, the General Superintendent of our Mission in the Tamil area, went on a memorable visit to Hyderabad invited there by a godly soldier. They came back and laid before the Madras Synod their plan for a new Mission to the Nizam's Dominion. There was virgin soil untilled by any other Christian agency. The men of the Madras Synod cut down their own allotments by £500 in order to help Burgess to start work in Hyderabad. This is not the place to tell the whole story, but it is well worth telling. Burgess had some initial advantages over the men who began our work in the Tamil and Kanarese fields. He had learnt

by their mistakes. He meant to go to those who needed him most and were most ready to receive the Gospel. In the first 'breathless year' of service in Hyderabad he laid down the lines of development for the district which have since been followed with great success. He had already worked among Telugu people in the city of Madras and had begun the study of that language. He took with him from Madras two young Indian workers trained by himself, who became the first ordained Indian ministers of the new district. Almost immediate success followed the preaching of the Word in English among the soldiers at Trimulgherry, in Tamil at Chaddarghat and in Telugu at Secunderabad, but the greatest results occurred among the Malas of the villages amongst whom Benjamin Pratt, his first missionary colleague, was remarkably used in building up the Church. Station after station was occupied. One of these has become known far and wide. Medak circuit work was begun by W. Hunt Soper, but it is through Charles W. Posnett and his colleagues that its amazing development has taken place. When Burgess after thirty years of service in India was about to return home early in 1896 his place on the staff of the district was filled by the advent of Posnett who came out a few months before Burgess left. Pratt succeeded Burgess as General Superintendent, and the Mission went forward without intermission in its work of gathering in the Malas. A crisis occurred when H. Guard Price, who had previously worked in the Tamil field, admitted the Madigas in the Kundi Circuit into the fold. By the tact, firmness and good humour of the missionaries and Indian ministers the tension between Mala and Madiga in the Church abated. Now the two classes come for baptism together when a new village is won. As a result of the mass movement in the Telugu area of our Mission, our Hyderabad District is by far the largest of the four districts which make up our South India Provincial Synod, and this in spite of the fact that it is the youngest of the districts. The whole Provincial area was originally worked from Madras. In 1849 the Kanarese and Tamil work in the Mysore country was organized into a separate district with headquarters in Bangalore. Work in Hyderabad began in 1879 and in 1883 was formed into a new district. Though the two Tamil districts of Madras and Trichinopoly were only placed under separate Synods in 1885, work had begun in them more than a century ago. Hyderabad, on the other hand, celebrated its Jubilee only last year. It has many distinctions over the other districts, not least that in Medak there is a most beautiful House of God such as we have in no other station in South India. But more important still is the movement of caste people along the Godavery towards Christ. It began in connection with the Nirmal Mission, a piece of indigenous work under the control of a young Indian minister lent for the purpose by the Madras District (another link between the Madras and Hyderabad districts) whose work is supported by the contributions of our

Indian Churches both in Hyderabad and in the more Southern districts. The caste movement began with a Summer School at Medak in 1926 to which some hundreds of caste Hindus were invited. The movement grows from year to year. Already many hundreds of people of all castes have confessed Christ, being publicly baptized in the Godavery river. It looks as if through the disobedience of the caste people in the caste-ridden south, when such men as Burgess and Ellis brought Christ to their doors, it has pleased God to show mercy to the outcaste and now, by the mercy shown to them, the caste people themselves are beginning to obtain mercy. 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God ! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out !'

This very inadequate account of the way the Church has grown in the Tamil and Telugu fields of our Mission must be supplemented by some account of the work in the Kanarese field. Bangalore was visited as early as 1821 by Hoole and Mowat, but the work suffered from the same causes of ill-success as that in the Tamil field. The first missionaries scattered their efforts by following the soldier from cantonment to cantonment. There was lack of concentration, continuity and co-ordination in their policy, till Thomas Hodson was transferred from Calcutta in 1832. He at least knew what he wanted and with the exception of ten years spent at home he was the dominant personality of the Mysore Mission till his retirement in 1878. His policy was clear but not in every instance successful. Yet he did a fine piece of work. By agreement with the L.M.S. the Mission is responsible for evangelizing four-fifths of the Mysore State.

Our missionaries in Mysore labour amongst a prosperous and intensely conservative class of yeomanry. There has been no large mass movement in the area, although during the present century an interesting movement amongst the Pariahs of Kastur has had some of the features of a mass movement. In the rest of the Kanarese field the gains have been made one by one and in the face of exceptional difficulties. The notorious case of Dasappa, who was converted in 1893 and by decree of the Mysore High Court was for that reason deprived of his civil rights and even refused the custody of his own children, illustrates one of the difficulties with which the messengers of the Gospel are confronted in the Mysore State. The Mission has used the elementary school and the press to diffuse Christian teaching. A press was carried on with success from 1840 to 1872 in Bangalore and was then closed down by orders from home. Henry Haigh, who came to India in 1875, was no ordinary man. He left his mark on our Mysore City Mission. One of his many enterprising acts was to reopen the Press in that City where it is now a flourishing institution in which he and other well-known missionaries like Henry Gulliford and E. W. Thompson have done good service in editing the *Harvest Field*, now the *N.C.C.*

Review, a medium of missionary opinion and the *Vrittanta Patrika*, a vernacular weekly, which has a wide circulation and influence in the Kanarese country. Josiah Hudson succeeded Thomas Hodson as Chairman and was supported by the labours of a group of men who arrived in India in the seventies. Four of them put in a service of over fifty years each; J. A. Vanes (1876), D. A. Rees (1877), G. W. Sawday (1877) and H. Gulliford (1877). From the beginning till now the largest numerical increases in the Christian community of the Mysore District have been amongst the Tamils of Bangalore and Kolar Gold Fields. The Tamil Mission in Bangalore has in the Goodwill High School for Girls' a residential school of the type which is ardently desired for the boys of our Christian community.

To give even a summary account of work done by our Church and Mission for women and by women is outside the scope of this paper. The Women's Auxiliary of the Missionary Society was founded in 1858. It has recently become the Women's Department of the Society. Each of the districts would be immeasurably poorer without its aid. Almost all our hospitals, all our best residential schools and some of our best industrial work is under the care of missionaries of the Women's Department.

For almost forty years the work of the four District Synods has been co-ordinated by the Provincial Synod which meets each year in January. This Synod is the highest authority in our Church in South India, but is not an autonomous body as the other negotiating Churches are. The Conference in England is the supreme governing body of our South India Church. The Union Scheme contemplates the grant of autonomy but not the withdrawal of supplies of men, women or money. There is a separate Pastoral Session in each of the Synods. But the bulk of the work of the Synods is done in the Representative Sessions where Ministers and Laity are present. The Local Committees that represented the Missionary Society have been abolished and it accepts the recommendations of the Synods as final in all matters affecting policy and grants. James Cooling who was General Superintendent of Madras District from 1885 to 1915 did much to foster self-government in the Church.

It has been quite impossible even to mention many of the activities of our Mission in South India, about which much might be written. For example, the work of F. W. Kellett and D. G. M. Leith amongst educated people in Triplicane will not soon be forgotten. But limits of space forbid one to add more about that. Whilst activities for the betterment of man are prominent in our Mission stations, a much needed emphasis on the place of worship in our life is beginning to influence policy. The House of God ought surely to be the best in every station. It has not always been so. The new Churches in Medak, Tiruvallur, Chadarghat, Nirmal and Dharapuram bear witness to the dawn of a better day.

Report of Joint Commission on Church Union in South India

L.M.S.

January, 1931.

N.B.—In a covering letter to India it will be explained that Sections II and III were written for the benefit of home readers and need only be used in India so far as they may be considered to be helpful.

I. PREAMBLE AND TERMS OF REFERENCE.

The London Missionary Society has been asked by certain Councils of the South India United Church with which it is closely associated, to give advice upon the Scheme of Union now under consideration by those Councils, more particularly in regard to the following matters:—

1. Whether the principles of Reformed Religion are safeguarded in the proposed Scheme.
2. Whether the carrying out of such a scheme would hinder the full fellowship at present existing between the churches connected with the Society at home and the churches in India.
3. What would be the effect of the Scheme upon the financial and administrative relations now existing between the L.M.S. and the churches in India.

The Society, feeling that the Scheme raises momentous issues for the Churches at home as well as in the mission field, invited the Congregational Union of England and Wales, the Congregational Union of Scotland, and the Union of Welsh Independents, to join with representatives of the Society in forming a Commission to consider the Scheme and advise. The persons elected to form this Commission were:—

Congregational Union of England and Wales.

Dr. S. Berry.
Dr. S. Cave.
Dr. A. J. Grieve.
Rev. T. T. James.
Dr. J. D. Jones.
Dr. A. Peel.

London Missionary Society.

Rev. W. Morton Barwell.
Mr. F. G. Bowers.
Mrs. B. Chaffey.
Rev. F. Lenwood.
Rev. G. E. Phillips.
Rev. N. A. Turner-Smith.

Scottish Congregational Union.

Dr. C. Richardson.

Union of Welsh Independents.

Rev. H. Elvet Lewis.

The Rev. W. N. Bitton was associated in an advisory capacity, and attended certain meetings,

The Rev. Maldwyn Johnes also attended the sections of the Commission in order to act as substitute for Dr. Berry when he could not be present.

The Rev. N. A. Turner-Smith was appointed by the Commission as Chairman, and the Rev. G. E. Phillips as Secretary.

The Commission's Report, as indicated by the signatures, is unanimous.

The Terms of Reference are given in the following extract from a Resolution of the L.M.S. Board of April, 1930 :—

“ . . . The Joint Commission thus formed would examine the Scheme in detail and prepare comments in the light of its study of the whole situation, bearing in mind the ‘Fundamental Principle’ of the L.M.S. It would report to all the bodies appointing it, and should be free to give whatever advice it thinks best, but its chief function would be to advise the India Committee and the Board concerning the effect of the proposed union, or modifications thereof, upon future relationships between (1) the Churches which have arisen out of L.M.S. activity in South India, and (2) the Congregational Churches at the home base, together with those of other denominations supporting the L.M.S.”

The Commission considered that it could best fulfil its task by advising on the main features of the Scheme, rather than by restricting itself narrowly to particular points. It has made no attempt at an exhaustive evaluation of details, since these are not yet in their final form.¹

II. THE CHURCHES CONCERNED.

(Omitted for want of space. Ed.)

III. SUMMARY OF THE SCHEME'S MAIN PROVINCES.

(Omitted for want of space. Ed.)

IV. THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF THE L.M.S.

In considering any proposals for the organization of a Church in any mission field, the London Missionary Society must view them in the light of its ‘Fundamental Principle’ adopted at its foundation in 1795 :—

‘As the union of Christians of various denominations in carrying on this great work is a most desirable object, so, to prevent,

¹ There are a number of passages in the Scheme which are obscure, and we assume that before the present or any amended Scheme is adopted, the S.I.U.C. will satisfy itself by a careful study of the language and construction of the various sections that it approves the Scheme in detail, including any amendments made. If union takes place, the actual Constitution of the Church will be based on the Scheme as adopted. It would be unfortunate if it emerged at that stage that the Churches were not of one mind on important points, and that they had been giving the clauses different meanings, or had, for some reason, assumed the meaning to be different from that conveyed by the words used.

if possible, any cause of future dissension, it is declared to be a Fundamental Principle of the Missionary Society that its design is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other form of Church Order and Government (about which there may be difference of opinion among serious persons), but the Glorious Gospel of the blessed God, to the heathen; and that it shall be left (as it ought to be left) to the minds of the persons whom God may call into the Fellowship of His Son from among them to assume for themselves such form of Church Government as to them shall appear most agreeable to the Word of God.'

This 'Fundamental Principle,' to which we adhere, emphasises the perfect liberty of the Christians of any community to adopt their own form of Church organization, and involves (a) the recognition of the unity in Christ of all those who trust in Him, (b) the belief that questions of organization are of subordinate importance. A Church is constituted not by its possession of a particular form of Church government, but by the presence in it of Christ, Who alone is the Church's head. These two deductions have guided our deliberations.

We therefore make known our whole-hearted sympathy with the desire for union in India. The difficulties which arise when the Church is divided, are to be regarded with grave anxiety, and our sense of responsibility is the heavier when we see in India the perpetuation of differences which have originated in the West. These differences to-day are obscuring for India 'the simplicity which is in Christ,' and we are following with great interest the efforts which are being made to overcome them. That men of different races should have faced these problems together in prayer, in fellowship, and with constructive criticism, is bound to bear good fruit, and whatever may be the outcome, these discussions will, we believe, lead to increased mutual understanding in the search for truth which cannot fail to bring men nearer to the Will of God.

V. THE INTENTION OF THE SCHEME.

We consider it to be of first importance that under the guidance of the Spirit, India should have a Church which is truly Indian, and therefore we are ready to encourage the communities with which we are connected, to give the present Scheme the fullest and most sympathetic consideration, examining its implications and estimating its consequences; and we hold ourselves at the service of our Indian brethren to advise and help, recognizing that this is an experiment for which ultimately the Indian Churches alone must be responsible. It is the declared purpose of the Scheme to form a new branch of the Christian Church combining Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregational elements, capable of expressing the genius

of an Eastern people, and at the same time desiring to remain in communion with the parent Churches of the West. If it be found possible to form such a Church as is contemplated, the fact that it would be in communion with Churches which are not in communion with one another, while not without its practical difficulties, need not be regarded as an obstacle to the experiment. It might even serve as a possible aid to reconciliation in the West.

VI. THE CONGREGATIONAL PRINCIPLE.

We are naturally expected to offer some judgment upon the place given in the Scheme to the Congregational principle. As Congregationalists, we do not attach the importance to matters of organization and order which the Scheme appears to suggest, nor can we believe that the unity of the Spirit is dependent upon uniformity in these respects. We believe that the unity of the Spirit is consistent with great varieties of organization, that there may be 'differences of administration, but the same Lord,' and 'diversities of operation, but the same God who worketh all in all.'

To us, a Church is a community of believing men and women, and the government of this community is the sacred obligation of its members in fellowship together with Christ. In any genuinely united Church, this congregational element must be as effectively operative as the presbyterian and episcopal elements. In general, we hold that this is not sufficiently provided for in the Scheme as now published, and most of the suggestions which we offer in the following statement, have the aim of strengthening the Congregational contribution to the life of the united Church.

VII. THE TWO CREEDS.

We notice that the 'Apostles' and 'Nicene' Creeds are to be accepted 'as witnessing to and safeguarding that faith which is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ, and as containing a sufficient statement thereof for a basis of union' (III.A).

In view of the fact that in recent years the Creeds have become the subject of controversy even in the Churches which accept them, it would be dangerous to the peace of any Church to make them, without qualification, its basis of union. The S.I.U.C. has already defined its attitude to the Creeds in answer to the Lausanne Report, declaring that 'when the two Creeds are accepted as a basis of fellowship, it is not admitted that they are complete and unalterable.' We should ourselves prefer to say that we accept them as historic confessions of the faith on which the Church is based, but not as final statements in which every clause has full authority. Some such reservation ought to be explicit in the proposed new basis of union if the unfortunate experiences of the West are to be avoided.

We suggest that the use of the Creeds should be optional, that freedom of interpretation be allowed, and that they should be always subordinated

to the less formal and more experimental expression of the Christian faith in the Scriptures of the New Testament. We notice that under the proposed Scheme it is provided that 'no authority of the united Church may forbid the use of these Creeds in worship' (IX.D.), and also 'that in its public worship the united Church must retain for its congregations freedom either to use historic forms or not to do so as may best conduce to edification and to the worship of God in spirit and in truth' (III.E). We understand this latter to mean that no authority in the united Church could compel congregations to use these Creeds in worship; but it would be well for this to be made explicit.

We attach great importance to the provisions: (a) that it shall not be necessary for candidates for baptism to use the actual words of the Creeds [VI. (6)], and (b) that those about to be ordained are not necessarily to repeat the Creeds, but are to affirm their belief in the truths to which they witness, remembering that acceptance of a written standard is insufficient without 'an inward personal experience of union with God in Christ' [VIII.D (3)].

VIII. EPISCOPACY.

In view of the intention of the Scheme to preserve in vital conjunction three elements of Church government, we cannot but regard the insistence upon the use of the phrase 'historic episcopate' as unfortunate. While some Congregationalists are not averse to an episcopal form of government, and the question of its expediency for India is for the Indian Church itself to consider, we distrust the term 'historic episcopate,' implying, as it may, a conception of the working of God's grace which seems to us to be contrary to the nature of the Gospel. We therefore recommend the S.I.U.C. to adhere to its General Assembly's amendments concerning episcopacy. Certain conceptions commonly associated with the term have proved in the Western Church such fruitful causes of disruption that we regard them as the wrong foundation upon which to build a united Church in the East. We recognize the natural desire of those who conscientiously value these conceptions that continuity with the episcopate of the early centuries should be maintained. But for the sake of the consciences of those who, like ourselves, hold these conceptions to be mistaken, there should be in the basis of union itself evidence that two of the three uniting Churches agree to this arrangement only for the sake of union, and that for them episcopacy is simply a form of Church government and not the constitutive element of the Church.

In the next paragraph we indicate some of the points at which the Scheme reveals an implicit interpretation of episcopacy which would inevitably lead to future discord,

IX. THE POWERS OF THE BISHOPS.

We consider that the proposed powers of bishops in formulating and regulating the public business of the Church are excessive, and we call attention to the following specific instances :—

(A) *Applications for Ordinations.* Section VII. Part I. (A) (3), which appears to permit an individual bishop to refuse an application for ordination, has been questioned by the S.I.U.C. in Amendment No. 7. We suggest that it would be more consistent with the spirit and meaning of ordination if this power of veto were not in the hands of the bishops alone. The presbyters, who take an equal part with the bishop in the act of ordination, ought to take an equal part with him in what may be the even more grave responsibility of withholding ordination. If situations dangerous to the peace and unity of the Church are to be avoided, a candidate ought to have the right of laying his application before a body including both bishop and presbyters, if the bishop for any reason cannot recommend him.

(B) *Consecration of Bishops.* As a sign of the participation of the diocese in the ordination prayer over its future bishop, and in accordance with the view of two of the three uniting bodies that the grace of God in ordination is not conferred merely through the presence of bishops, we recommend the participation of presbyters in the laying on of hands at all consecrations of bishops.

(C) *Supplementary Statements on Faith and Order, Etc.* It is laid down that the united Church may issue supplementary statements concerning the faith for the guidance of its teachers and the edification of the faithful, provided that such statements be not contrary to the truth of our religion revealed in the holy scriptures (Section III.A. Note). Nevertheless, the bishops have special powers which almost amount to a veto regarding whatever concerns the faith and doctrine of the Church [see VIII.C. (7)]. This seems to us excessive, and we attach importance to the intention underlying the S.I.U.C. Amendment No. 8, to the effect that a matter so stayed by the bishops shall be dealt with in accordance with the provisions made for alteration of the constitution, but we do not think that the amendment provides sufficient safeguards. (See Appendix.)

X. THE MINISTRY.

In view of the future relationship of the Congregational ministry to the proposed Church, it is necessary to say that we do not regard the Church as constituted by a ministry in which episcopal ordination is essential, but by a community of believing men and women from among whom ministers are called. The divine authority for their ministry comes not from man but from God; the only authority which man can confer upon such a ministry

is relatively to place and order. For this reason we endorse the amendment of the S.I.U.C. that episcopal ordination is not to be considered as the dividing line between a so-called 'valid' and 'invalid' ministry, but we consider that this ought to have practical expression within the constitution itself. If the constitution provided that while the normal form of the united Church's government was episcopal, there could always be within the united Church certain recognized and sanctioned exceptions to the normal, one stumbling-block to many minds would be removed, since it would then be clear that there is no intention to treat non-episcopal ministries as 'invalid.' Among such exceptions might well be the case of missionaries from the non-episcopal Churches, ordained at home, duly commissioned for service in India, and accepted by the united Church under the terms of its constitution.

The Scheme [IV.B. (6)] makes this provision for thirty years, after which 'the united Church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry.' But the freedom of the united Church to sanction such exceptions after thirty years is denied by the opening sentence of the paragraph in question [IV.B. (6)] :—

'The uniting Churches agree that it is their intention and expectation that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church, will be an episcopally ordained minister.'

These two sentences conflict with each other in a measure which calls for amendment by the Joint Committee.

If the problem of reconciling the non-episcopal and episcopal elements in the united Church proves insoluble at this stage, it may be considered wise to leave the matter open for a generation, reserving to the united Church itself the right to decide in the light of experience. But we must point out the grave danger attending such a course. Should the united Church thirty years hence close the door to permanent service within its borders against every non-episcopally ordained minister, it would thereby erect a barrier of separation between itself and the home Churches connected with our Missionary Society such as it certainly does not at present intend. In such circumstances we should find it difficult to secure new missionaries, nor could we reasonably ask from home Churches aid for the building up of a Church which repudiated their ministry. Moreover, if non-episcopal ministries are accepted for a period and at the end are rejected from the final constitution of the Church, it may rightly be said that the act of faith by which those ministers were accepted during the interim period, is ultimately discredited; for if a non-episcopal ministry can be accepted as 'valid' for an interval, however short or long, it ought to be accepted permanently. If, however, the provision now contemplated for thirty years could be made

permanent, we think that candidates for missionary service could still be found, and that some of them might be willing to postpone their ordination until after arrival in India, always provided that thereby no question was implied concerning the ministry of their home Church.

XI. SACRAMENTS.

The Scheme provides [VII.I.C. (1)] that 'none except presbyters and bishops have the right to celebrate the Holy Communion.' We take it that this rule is made in the interests of order, and not because the efficacy of the sacrament depends upon a special mode or agent of administration. In our view, the efficacy of a sacrament depends upon its being received in faith, hope and love towards the present Lord Who imparts His grace. In this matter of sacraments we feel the need of special care lest arrangements rightly made to suit the conscience of one of the uniting bodies, should ultimately have the effect of wounding the conscience of the other two. We offer the following suggestions :—

1. Since the above rule is one of order, the following exceptions could properly be made :—

- (a) Sacraments might be celebrated by ordained ministers (presbyters) from the parent Churches receiving authorizations from bishops as laid down in VII.I.A. (4);
- (b) They might be celebrated by laymen to whom the Church in its discretion gave authority, *e.g.*, in cases where otherwise, owing to local conditions, the sacrament might have to be omitted for long periods together.

Such a provision would be in keeping with the existing practice in certain districts, which could not be discontinued without giving ground for disquiet. It would also serve as a practical expression of the principle of the S.I.U.C., which does not commit itself to the position that episcopal ordination is 'the dividing line between a 'valid' and an 'invalid' ministry.

2. In IX.B., which enumerates elements which will be constituent parts of every Communion Service, there should be added an explicit reference to the general principle laid down in III.E. 'The united Church must retain for its congregations freedom either to use historic forms or not to do so as may best conduce to edification and to the worship of God in spirit and in truth.' The principle should logically apply to liturgical forms which may later develop, as well as to such forms inherited from the past.

XII. POSITION OF WOMEN IN THE UNITED CHURCH.

We recognize that the wording of many sections of the Scheme is intended to apply to women equally with men, but in view of the place already being taken by women in parts of the Indian Church and in public life, we suggest the advisability of more explicit definition of their place in the united Church. At present the only specific reference is under the ministry of the laity 'as Deaconesses and Women Workers' [Section VII. Part II. (2) (e)]. This might be read as excluding women from the other functions in (a) to (f), *e.g.*, from being elders or representatives on Church bodies. The place of women in the Church is clearly a matter for the Church itself to deal with, but there should be nothing in the constitution inconsistent with the fact that in Christ there is neither male nor female. It is noteworthy that at the very inception of the Church of Christ in China, its General Assembly voted that there should be no distinction between men and women in the life and work of the Church and with respect to eligibility for office.

XIII. CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, we desire to make it clear that the criticism offered above is, in no way, to be regarded as a departure from our 'Fundamental Principle,' to which we adhere. We have been moved chiefly by the following considerations: First, to give some judgment upon how far the congregational principle can be said to have been embodied in a scheme which desires to conserve that principle; second, to give our Indian brethren the fruits of our own experience in the West, so that the errors into which we have fallen may not be repeated in the East; third, to give some indication as to how the 'Proposed Scheme' would be regarded by those who at present are L.M.S. supporters.

As to the last, we desire to assure the Churches of our undiminished affection, and our thankfulness for every effort that is made to strengthen the witness of the Church of Christ in India. It would be an offence against our highest ideals if the L.M.S. should ever stand in the way of such a movement towards the complete freedom and autonomy of the Indian Church under the Spirit of Christ. No fear of an ultimate withdrawal of financial support from the West should be allowed to hinder progress in that direction. The response to our appeal, not only for money but for men and women to serve in India, will naturally be affected by the nature of the final scheme adopted, but we should be sorry indeed if this fact were allowed to weigh too greatly in the decisions which have to be made, for our one desire is that India should take Christ to her heart, and that He should lead His people. We trust that this may find expression in a united Church without impairing our fellowship. Let the work which has this

end in view continue, and may those on whom is laid the difficult task of conducting the negotiations, enjoy the guidance of that Spirit Who will lead them into all truth! We say from our hearts, 'Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.'

(Signed) W. MORTON BARWELL.
 SIDNEY M. BERRY.
 F. G. BOWERS.
 SYDNEY CAVE.
 H. MARION CHAFFEY.
 A. J. GRIEVE.
 T. T. JAMES.
 J. D. JONES.
 FRANK LENWOOD.
 H. ELVET LEWIS.
 ALBERT PEEL.
 CHARLES RICHARDSON.
 N. A. TURNER-SMITH (*Chairman*).
 G. E. PHILLIPS (*Secretary*).

Resolutions of the Madras Church Council of the S.I.U.C. with reference to Union

The Madras Church Council met at Ranipet, N. Arcot, on October 29, 1930, and adopted the following report of its Committee on Union:—

Your Committee read through carefully the reports received from sixteen out of thirty sessions, and also the views on the Proposed Scheme of Union of the Deputation of the Reformed Church Board in America and the Committee of the Assembly of the Church of Scotland.¹ The Committee found that while one of the 16 Churches desired to be convinced of the value of Union, another to know the mind of the Home Board and a third was unable to reach any conclusion, the remaining thirteen are in favour of accepting the Scheme of Union if it could be modified along the lines suggested by the resolutions on the subject passed at the last meeting of the Madras Church Council. The Committee also desire the Council to thank those bodies in America and Scotland for the care which they have bestowed on the Scheme, for the freedom they desire to give to the South India United Church in its progress towards large union and the valuable suggestions they have offered for making the Scheme more acceptable.

¹ The Church of Scotland document was published in No. 3 of *Church Union—News and Views*. The Statement regarding Union by the Deputation of the Reformed Church in America is published herewith.

With these words your Committee recommends the following resolutions :—

I. That the Council desire to put on record the fact that the failure of many sessions to communicate their views on a subject which affects vitally the kingdom of God is disappointing, and desire to request all sessions to take a more lively interest in this matter.

II. That the Council feel that the fresh developments of the Union negotiations leave ample room for further negotiations with the Anglican and Wesleyan Churches.

III. That this Council support the continuance of the negotiations through the Union Committee with the Anglicans and Wesleyans and request the members of the Union Committee from our Church to do their best to secure the inclusion in the Scheme of Union the amendments proposed by our General Assembly and this Church Council.

IV. That we instruct our Secretary to send to the Chairman of the Joint Committee the resolutions passed by this Council on the subject of Church Union.¹

VIRUTHAMPET,
November 6, 1930.

(Signed) C. J. LUCAS,
Secretary.

Church Union

[FROM THE ^{Revised} Arcot Mission Deputation Report, 1930]

We congratulate the Arcot Assembly on its share in the proposals for a union of the South India United Church with the Anglican and Wesleyan communions. We believe that such a union may become a most important factor in the development of a really indigenous Christian Church, as throughout the years to come there takes place a larger and larger interchange of laymen and of pastors moving to and fro among the districts hitherto influenced by only one type of Christian thinking, life, and worship. The gradually awakening self-consciousness of India will be much more effectively influenced by a large and unified body of Christians than by separate group of unrelated Christians. Furthermore, the understanding of one Christian group by another, sympathy with one another's attitudes, learning one from another, all these will be extremely limited as long as Christian groups remain apart within the circumference of their original mission areas. We have been led to wonder whether the union of the South India United Church has made the fullest use of its possibilities in promoting the real fellowship of its constituent parts, but we have met no one who has not borne his testimony to the fact that

¹ The Resolutions of the Madras Council adopted in March, 1930, are printed herewith. The suggestions contained in these resolutions have been largely carried out in the revision made by the Joint Committee in their recent meeting. (EDITOR).

the unification of the present three communions has brought with it numerous blessings. We can find no argument against the proposed union which was not urged with equal vehemence years ago against the proposal to found the South India United Church urged often by men who to-day are enthusiastic in their commendation of the results of the union.

It seems to us that there is now present a real spiritual fellowship between the three Churches looking forward to the possibility of union, and that the Spirit of God can be trusted to smooth the way to further fellowship. It is plainly unwise to wait until the end is clear before beginning the journey. No progress can be made by that method, nor will any union be possible if it must await decisions which shall show in detail how the difficulties which now seem to hold the Christians apart will at last be resolved. Is it not enough that there is a willingness to accept one another, to welcome one another with thankful hearts praising God that the Spirit has manifested His presence in varied ways? It is, of course, true that no document should be accepted without the most careful consideration, and that the proposed plan of union should not be agreed to until it is thoroughly understood, but may there not be a temptation to insist on so many details that the future work of God's own Spirit may be limited and hindered? We have found in the Proposed Scheme of Union no theological or ecclesiastical propositions that make the plan impossible for a Reformed or Presbyterian Church. We have found much that is a statement of precisely the forms and ideas for which our Church has always stood. We should wish to be very sure that nothing in this form of agreement will place ministers and laymen of the united Church out of communion with the Christians of America and England from which it springs. Unless the fellowship is preserved in all its completeness this new venture will not result in union, but in dissension; we think this point should be very clear and definite, but we also think the negotiations have now reached such a stage of mutual understanding that the burden of proof rests definitely on any suggestion that the plan is dangerous or impossible. The proposal appeals to us as a glorious venture of Christian faith and we should welcome any action which might lead to its approval.

Lambeth and the Ninth Session

The inclusion in the same issue of *Church Union News and Views* (January 1931) of extracts from the Lambeth Report and the findings of the Ninth Session of the Joint Committee on Union in South India suggests a comparison of the two. Such a comparison may not be merely incidental; it may prove to be of some value. The point of view here given is that of a non-episcopalian.

The Anglican Church, it has been said, is a 'bridge church'. No one would deny it that important and significant title; but, should a comment on it be allowed, one would like to urge that if it is to be a bridge church it is important that its supports should be planted equally firmly on each side of the river. The Anglican Church has been likened to the Roman god, Janus; not, let it be rightly and emphatically stated, to Mr. Facing-both-ways—such a comparison would be cynical and unjust. But if it may be likened to the god, Janus—a not ignoble comparison—perhaps the comment may be allowed, that it is required of it that it should look at both sides equally.

It is here that Free Church criticisms of the Lambeth Report have their origin. Full consideration is given to the possibilities for union with episcopal Churches, but to dismiss in a few lines important admissions, both on the part of Anglicans and Free Churchmen, arising out of conversations extending over a period of four years, does not seem to observe that proportion in presentation of results arrived at which the occasion really demands. As a result of the 'Malines conversations', in the summary of the Lambeth Committee's Report on Union reference is made to an attempt at a 'rapprochement des cœurs'. Is it not something far more than a mere attempt at such a rapprochement, not only of hearts but of minds, that, on the one hand, Free Churchmen have expressed their willingness to acknowledge episcopacy as a *sine qua non* of Union, while on the other hand leading Anglican Bishops, led by the Archbishop of Canterbury, have acknowledged that certain Free Church Ministries are in their sphere real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church? Have we, then, that equal presentation of both sides, for which a 'bridge' Church is pre-eminently responsible?

And when we turn to the South India Scheme and Lambeth's attitude to it, there is still the feeling that there is a similar hesitation to face both sides of the issue, with an equal degree of frankness. Let us take the question of the Ministry. Lambeth states in its Report, (p. 116), 'the earnest desire to restore union makes possible a recognition by the Church, in some respects, of ministries which, in separation, must stand on a different footing.' If the United Church comes into being not merely an earnest desire and not merely a will and intention, but an actual decision for union will have been made between Episcopalians and Non-Episcopalians. What has Lambeth to say, then, about its relationship with the United Church? This is dealt with on page 125 and so far as can be seen nothing is said to show in any way recognition of those non-episcopally ordained ministers, who will have shown by their consent to the Scheme their desire for Union. It is definitely implied that only when ministers in the united Church are episcopally ordained will there be recognition of their status

and rights and responsibilities. 'These provisions represent certain restrictions upon complete interchangeability of ministers and complete mutual admissibility to communion We hope that when the unification within the united Church is complete, full communion in that sense will be secured between the United Church and the Churches of the Anglican Communion.' Now, the phrase, 'unification within the united Church', can only refer to the time when all ministers are episcopally ordained. So far as Lambeth is concerned, even in the united Church, those who are non-episcopally ordained are still without the pale. One is strongly tempted to ask whether Lambeth would have given its blessing to the scheme if the united Church was, as is not the case, to be within the Anglican Communion. One is strongly tempted to say that the Anglicans in India have agreed to separation, North from South, with a view to Union, and Anglicans in England have been able to agree to this union in view of separation.

But why stress all this? For this reason, that the implications underlying this may have much more significance than the argument up to the present has justified in view of the findings of the Ninth Session of the Joint Committee held in Madras last November. For there is no gainsaying the fact that while in principle we believe that we are still in line with Lambeth, in detail we have gone much beyond it.

But before coming to detail something must be said of the wonderful spirit shown. The writer went to the Ninth Session in a spirit, if not of scepticism, at any rate of doubt. He came away convinced that, so long as the same spirit and determination to see the will of God and to do it is maintained, then Union is not a thing of the future, it is, in essence, a fact of the present. It is fatally easy to write pious platitudes and to talk vain nothings. How often the Church itself has done it! And it may be that to some who read in cold print the 'Foreword' to the findings of the Ninth Session the phrases may seem to be nothing but 'sounding brass and tinkling cymbal', empty of all meaning and life. The truth is quite opposite. Those paragraphs were written with a due sense of their meaning, not before criticism of the Scheme but after full consideration of the vision of the united Church as it had been conceived.

The motive underlying the alterations suggested in the Scheme is due to that vision, and if that motive has led us in details to move further away from the findings of Lambeth, then however justifiable and however carefully guarded the motives of Lambeth may be, we hold to the spirit of our suggested alterations because we believe them to be of God. As it happened, this Ninth Session was very largely concerned with principles which Anglicans hold with conviction, and it is right that grateful mention should be made of the unfailing patience and readiness to understand and breadth of vision shown by the Anglican representatives.

What, then, are some of the alterations made? In what way do they differ from the findings at Lambeth? And first of all, Episcopacy.

It has been one of the grounds for the general acceptance of this much debated subject that no theory of the historic episcopacy should be demanded or stated in the Scheme. It has been considered sufficient that the fact should be accepted without interpretation. The Conference definitely stated that 'We assent to the provision that those who untie in acceptance of the Episcopate with the functions assigned to it in the Scheme should not be required to accept any one particular interpretation of it' (p. 127). So far as the writer understands the Scheme, room is given for any and every interpretation that an individual may feel himself justified in holding, from the theory that bishops in relation to Presbyters are only *primus inter pares* to the theory of their divine right. But Lambeth goes on to say in reference to the possibility of Presbyters 'laying on' hands at the consecration of bishops:—'We prefer that it be not adopted lest it tend to confusion, and we would urge that, if it be adopted, care should be taken to make it plain that the Presbyters do not take part as Consecrators.' Does not this seem to prejudge the question of 'interpretation'? If it is to be definitely taught that Presbyters do not consecrate, does not such teaching imply that bishops are necessarily apart from Presbyters? Episcopacy may be accepted from the point of view of order, but not necessarily as an order.

So far as the Ninth Session is concerned it may be sufficient to quote the resolution on this subject to show from how very different a point of view the question was faced.

'The Joint Committee forwards the following statement to the governing bodies of the uniting Churches and wishes them to consider whether it would be right to incorporate this as a note to Section VII Part I. (B) (7):—

'In view of the common desire to carry over from the uniting Churches into the united Church all elements which may in any way contribute to the fullest expression of truths which have been valued in the Christian Church, it shall be permissible for Presbyters to join with the bishops in the laying on of hands at the consecration of a bishop; provided that it always be remembered and taught that the true Consecrator is God to whom prayer is made.'

Is it not obvious that the resolution of the Ninth Session would, if accepted, raise the whole question on to a different level and out of the region of debate. Though it differs from Lambeth, is there anything inherently wrong in the principle underlying it?

Let us take a second question, that of Intercommunion and by way of corollary Inter-celebration?

In dealing with the Synoptic Problem passages are often set side by side to show that they are 'synoptic'. Is this passage fully 'synoptic'?

Lambeth

If communicant members or ordained ministers of the united Church should go into any diocese of the Anglican Communion, the Church of that diocese should receive them to communion whenever this can be done consistently with the regulations of each Province or extra-Provincial diocese, and episcopally ordained ministers of the united Church should be qualified, at the discretion of the Bishop, to officiate, subject to the regulations of the diocese for its own ministers.

The Ninth Session

It is expected that all the Churches with which the united Church has relations of communion and fellowship will be willing to receive any communicant member of the United Church to Communion as a visitor in any of their Churches.

Any minister of the united Church is at liberty to minister and to celebrate the Communion in any church of a Church with which any of the uniting Churches enjoys relations of fellowship, if invited to do so.

The extracts of the Ninth Session are taken from the Appendix in which the implications of the Scheme in relation to communion and inter-communion are set forth in detail. It is clear from these that the aim of the united Church is definitely to recognize and to make possible for its own members the ministrations of others who are outside its borders and to look for similar recognition of its own membership and ministry within the borders of churches elsewhere. It will not tie itself down so as to become merely another sect, it is its intention and hope to make possible wider and wider unions.

These criticisms of Lambeth are not written in a spirit of fault-finding. If that were so, they wouldn't be worth the scrap of paper on which they are written. But they raise this question:—Have we in South India gone too far for Lambeth? Will the Anglican Church at home remind us that we shall be a separate Church, and must remain apart, or will she with a finer courage open her doors and welcome us freely into her fellowship? It may well be that Lambeth, as representing a 'bridge church', feels that it must be cautious in all its statements, but we trust that that caution will not be carried too far. If it must look Eastwards to the Ancient Orthodox Churches, will it not look still further eastwards to the younger churches that are feeling their way to self-expression. If caution is all that is shown them and not something of encouragement that comes from vision and faith, they may well despair of their Union leading to wider union still, and that wider union is, after all, its only ultimate justification.

Clippings

Christ and the Church

(From *The Guardian*, London.)

The following is the Church Congress sermon preached in St. Paul's Church, Newport, by the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Headlam).

This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.—Ephesians v, 32.

I do not think that most people sufficiently realize how wonderful is St. Paul's teaching about the Christian Church; how great is the mystery, if that teaching be true. It was not thirty years since the Crucifixion, but the Christian Church already existed as a most

remarkable society, already stretching throughout a great part of the civilized world. It had its origin in Judaism, but it was separated from it. It had its new morality (a striking contrast to anything which the world had seen before) a new attitude to life, an embryo creed and organized worship. It had its officials, not exactly the same in form and name as they were later, but already looked upon as an essential part of its life, with a divine origin and spiritual gifts. It was already a large and important body. Only two or three years later than this Tacitus tells us that an immense multitude of Christians were put to death by Nero in the first great persecution. It was certainly a strange and significant growth.

But, if we are to trust St. Paul, this new society was not merely an organization; it possessed great spiritual and religious significance. The Church was the Body of Christ. The metaphor, indeed, varies. At one time St. Paul speaks of the Church as a Body, which is Christ Himself, and of which we are the individual members, and another time, the Church is the Body and Christ is the Head. But, whichever form the metaphor takes, we have here impressed upon us the close intimate spiritual and mystical union that there is between Christ and Christians, who have become spiritually and mystically part of him. But yet, again, the Church is the spouse of Christ, the spouse that He loved and gave Himself for—thus, incidentally, the ideal of Christian marriage is described. And yet, again, this Church is the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. This means that in and through the Church the divine purpose of Christ for the whole world is being fulfilled, and that it, therefore, may be looked upon as the extension or the fulfilling of His divine Person and attributes. Hence it is the source of spiritual life. From Christ as the Head, there flows throughout the whole body, throughout every limb and vein, the spiritual life which comes from Him, and this, we are told, is love. It is an organism, but it is an organism with a spiritual reality, and the bond which joins it together in this close and intimate union is that Christian virtue of love which has its source in Christ, and is the imitation of His life.

THE ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE

Of course we are used to this language; it is conventional to us; and therefore we miss its significance. But think of what its real spiritual meaning is, and then ask, Whence did this wonderful doctrine arise? I cannot find that in any of the sources of St. Paul's teaching there is any analogy to it. It is quite true that the word *ecclesia* had been used in the Hellenistic Jewish literature to signify the assembly of the saints of Israel. But the analogy takes us a very little way, and I cannot doubt—although many critics have been inclined to disallow it—that its source was in the action and the teaching of Christ. I do not think that you can explain the

ministry of Christ, or the growth of the Church, unless you realize that it was His purpose to create such a society as the Christian Church; that it was to be the transformation of the old Israel; that He intended it to have its new teaching, and its new ethic, and its ministry, and its Sacraments. It was not an accidental growth; it was part of the plan or purpose of Jesus Christ Himself.

Nor can I doubt that the spiritual significance of the new society was first taught by Christ Himself. I suppose that the critical historian of the life of our Lord would tell us that the Parable of the Vine, which describes the spiritual life of the Church as sustained by its life in Him, represented a later Paulinism. I see no reason for that perversion of the historical sequence. It seems to me that you cannot explain Paulinism unless you presuppose the teaching of Christ as it is presented to us by St. John. No doubt the language of St. John, or the author of the Fourth Gospel, whoever he was, was to a certain extent, his own. But often you will find that it is based upon teaching which is found in the other Gospels. I see no reason therefore, for doubting that in other cases it was based on a tradition of our Lord's teaching which has not elsewhere been preserved. The Parable of the Vine, and the Parable of the Good Shepherd, imply the idea of the Christian Church. Nor can you give its full significance to the Parables of the Kingdom; unless you realize that that was part of our Lord's teaching. The mystical teaching which St. Paul gives us about the Church was the direct development of our Lord's own words.

THE TRACTARIANS

The subject of the congress is 'Christ and Modern Life.' This doctrine of the Church is an essential element in the revelation of the being and mind of Christ. It has been the great failure of a large section of the Christian world in the last 300 years that they have had an inadequate grasp of the practical importance and the spiritual significance of the doctrine of the Christian Church. A few days ago there was an article in *The Times* which discussed the permanent value of the Tractarian Movement. Its old ideals had passed away and were changing. Anglo-Catholicism is something very different from Tractarianism. What is the permanent contribution to thought of that movement? I have no doubt at all myself that it is the teaching of the corporate side of the Christian life; of the brotherhood of mankind in Christ; of the spiritual union between Christ and His followers; of our salvation, not as individuals but as members of the great company of Christ's followers on earth. It was the conception of the one Catholic Church. The early Tractarians, like their Anglo-Catholic followers, prevented the practical realization of this ideal by a curious element of rigidity and narrowness, but the ideal burnt clearly and strongly in their thoughts.

It was the ideal of a Catholic Church which Newman and many others tried to find in the Church of Rome. It was this ideal of a Catholic Church which the Tractarians taught, first of all, to the Church of England, and this has transformed in many ways the thought of that Church, though only as reviving elements which were already present. This ideal has spread far beyond the limits of Anglicanism. It is working, sometimes more strongly, sometimes less strongly, in all the Protestant bodies, and, though still inadequately and imperfectly grasped, is the source of the many movements for Christian unity which our present age is exhibiting.

THE CONDITION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

The fundamental condition for Christian unity is a real belief in one Holy Catholic Church, and it is the absence of this belief which prevents the fulfilment of any such ideal. We hold that a belief in such a Church is the obvious and clear teaching of the Scriptures, and that this conception is exhibited to us historically in the Christian Church right up to the time of the Reformation. It is an essential condition for carrying out fully and completely the Christian ideal of universal brotherhood. But the schisms of the Reformation destroyed that ideal. As a reaction against the extreme centralization and institutionalism of the Medieval Church was developed an extreme Protestant individualism. That meant often a fuller realization of the individual Christian character and responsibility. It made men more conscious of their individual responsibility to God for the life they had to live. But it destroyed the possibility of true Christian brotherhood, and the Reformation theologians have been continuously concerned in developing theories of an invisible Church which might explain away the clear teaching of the New Testament.

It is the antithesis between this ideal, which was that of the Lambeth Report and certain current conceptions, which has caused the disappointment in some quarters with which that Report has been received. What the Anglican Communion puts before itself is one united Christian Church—a Church which may transcend the limits of races, and countries, and peoples—which may respond to national ideals but will yet bind nations together. It finds the possibility of this in its own unity, and it desires such unity on a wider scale for Christendom. But there are two conflicting conceptions. There are those who ask, Why demand this unification of the Churches? If we turn to political matters, we find that each nation has its own constitution, its own form of government. Why should not each national Church be organized in its own way? The answer is a clear one. We want a far greater unity between the national Churches than is possible between the different nations. We recognize, indeed, fully, the value of a national presentation of Christianity; we recognize, therefore, the

value of one national Church which will unite the people of any country together; but Christianity must be international too, or it cannot give us that brotherhood of nations and races which St. Paul, again and again, presents to us, and which we find depicted in the great vision of the Apocalypse. Christianity must be national, but the Christian Church should be the great international.

THE NON-CONFORMIST IDEAL

A second conflicting conception is that of a federation of Churches. That is what, as far as we can judge, the Non-conformists are aiming at and desiring. They are quite content that in this country there should be many different religious organizations—Congregationalist, Baptist, Wesleyan, Presbyterian, and so on. They would federate them together in some loose organization and demand inter-communion between them, and they are sore because the Lambeth Conference has refused to recognize such a federation, or to grant such an inter-communion. If the former theory conflicted with the true international basis of Christianity, this conflicts with national unity. You do not bind together a nation in one unity if you have a number of different Churches sometimes in conflict with one another, and exhibiting neither locally nor generally any true brotherhood. The Lambeth Conference believes, in opposition to both these theories, that what you must aim at is a united Catholic Church in which all the national Churches are bound together. It looks upon inter-communion as the goal rather than the beginning of such a unity. It does not think that there will be any reality in sharing our communion with others until we are bound to them in a real brotherhood.

A UNIFIED MINISTRY

Such a Catholic Church must mean a unified ministry. It has sometimes been urged that it is a mere obsession of the Anglican Communion that it lays so much stress upon the question of ministry. No doubt sometimes the interest in it seems disproportionate, but that has arisen not because within ourselves we dwell too much upon that ministry, but because it has been the point at which we have had to sustain so many attacks from outside. And when we turn to the New Testament we cannot feel that we are exaggerating the importance of the ministry when we find how great a position it is given, even so early in Christian history. 'God,' says St. Paul, 'hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers.' Surely we cannot think lightly of a ministry when it is ascribed directly to God's action among us. And, again, we are told how the ascended Christ 'gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up the Body of Christ.' I sometimes think that those who speak disparagingly of the importance ascribed to the Christ-

ian ministry have forgotten the teaching of the New Testament.

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

Nor can we doubt the teaching of history. So long as there was a united ministry the Church was united. The first great breach in unity arose with the development of the Papacy, which infringed upon the solidarity of the episcopate. From the time of the Reformation onwards we have had a dis-united Church and a dis-united ministry, and unity will only come when once more there is throughout the whole Church a ministry universally recognized, and that cannot be (so the Lambeth Conference has persistently said) except through the episcopate. It believes that for this opinion it has the testimony and witness of history, and to make its position quite clear it has defined what it means by the historic episcopate. It is, I think, of the gravest importance that we should recognize what that definition which it has given says, and what it does not say. It is based upon the teaching of the English Prayer-book; it dwells on the continuous testimony of history (the particular differences of opinion about origins do not really affect the question); it points out how the historical succession forms a link with the Church of the apostles.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS

But while it dwells thus on the value of the episcopate, and while it defines it in a similar way, whether in relation to South India, or the Non-conformists, or the Orthodox, it definitely and carefully avoids making any claims for the exclusive possession of spiritual gifts. We know too well the circumstances of the Reformation. We know how the variation of ministry which then arose may be condoned, owing to the abuses which had prevailed and the bitterness of the ecclesiastical contest. The Church of England has never taught or believed that those who have not an episcopal ministry are deprived of valid Sacraments. It would be monstrous to think that the Lutherans, or the Presbyterians, should for 400 years have deluded themselves into thinking that they receive spiritual grace through their Sacraments, and that these were really destitute of all reality. Whatever irregularities there may have been, we cannot believe that our Lord would not give His many devoted servants the spiritual food of His Body and Blood, in accordance with His promise. We cannot believe that He gives one sort of Sacrament to Churchpeople and another to Non-conformists. None of those things can be true, nor has the Church of England ever taught them, whatever individuals may have done. What we have said is that it does not follow that all ministries are of equal value, or that with this diversity of ministry Christian unity can be attained. I think we may put the teaching of our Church in this way:—We do not believe that episcopacy is necessary for the spiritual life of a Church, but we do believe that it is an essential of a united Church.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

A necessary condition of Christian unity is religious liberty. It has often seemed as if this was not the case. The Church has been so anxious for unity that it has aimed at suppressing all religious opinion which conflicted with conventional doctrine. It seemed so easy to unite people by prohibiting them from differing, to call in the authority of the State and coerce men into accepting what we know they ought to believe. Yet here has lain one of the greatest failures of Christianity in the past. It has been a failure because it has been inconsistent with the Christianity it wishes to promote. It is an essential part of the religion of Christ that it should be based upon a voluntary whole-hearted allegiance to Him. An allegiance which is forced ceases to be an allegiance at all. No one can be a true Christian unless he has accepted his Christianity in the spirit of liberty. Not only is it inconsistent with Christianity; it has been fatal to the very end at which it has aimed. If in the centuries before the Reformation, when medieval Christianity had played its part, there had been in the Church real freedom; if all the many movements for reform had been allowed to assert themselves freely; if there had not been an over-elaborate system of thought and worship and discipline overpowering life, there would have been no need for the great schisms of the Reformation. The Christian Church left free would have slowly absorbed the new teaching; it would have discarded what was outworn; and a Catholic Church adapted to the needs of a more advanced age would have developed itself.

And so it has always been. If religious thought in England since the Reformation had been quite free the various Non-conformist bodies would never have become stereotyped. Each age would have absorbed into itself all that the new teachers had to give us. And not only is the absence of religious freedom fatal to Christian unity, but Christian unity would be dangerous unless the Church were free. We want the Church to be one, but we do not want it to be uniform; we want it to be one, but we do not want its doctrine and worship and life to be so rigidly formalized that there is no room for growth and life and change. The ideal that we should put before us is that of a Free United Catholic Church.

And that leads to one further thought I would put before you—the need of a wise economy in the administration of a Christian Church and the danger of legal rigidity. There are indeed certain fundamental principles of faith and morality which cannot be modified or changed. The Christian Church would cease to be Christian if it denied its Master. Catholic faith must, in its very essence, be something which is unchanged. Fundamental principles of Christian morality are permanent; but not everything that we believe is part of the necessary Christian faith, and our morality is one of

principle and not of rule. Yet outside the limits of the Christian faith, an organized society like the Christian Church must have its regulations, its canons, its rules, and order of worship. They are very necessary to its orderly existence, but though they are necessary they do not represent anything which is unchangeable, or may not be modified. The rules of the Christian Church exist for the good of the Church and not the Church for the rules. So we have our principle of religious economy. This has been formulated for us by the Orthodox Church. The representatives of that body in the discussions at Lambeth stated, 'That the Church has full authority from its divine Founder to use economy upon matters which concern the advantage of the Church, upon condition that it does not clash in any way with the fundamental grounds of faith.' It has, I think, been a danger of the past in the Anglican Church that we have been too rigid. This has partly been the work of ecclesiastical lawyers. It has also been due to the history of the Church in the last hundred years. The Tractarian Movement revived the tradition of Church law, worship and custom. Catholic faith and order were in the nature of a new discovery, and naturally enough there was often a disproportionate insistence upon points which a wider knowledge would have shewn were not fundamental religious truths, but rules made for the well-being of the Church. The restoration of some sort of ecclesiastical discipline might introduce a healthy element into human life, but discipline can always be insisted upon in a way which defeats the very purpose for which it exists.

Now if we want, as we do want, to bring to an end our Christian divisions; if we want to find room in a united society for those who have been separated, and have lived for generations under different laws and with different customs, it will be necessary that we should exercise a wise economy in our administration. Rules and customs in which we ourselves have grown up, and seem natural and easy, will be irksome to those from outside, and we shall have to ask others to modify their own rules of worship or order. In the South Indian scheme we have found that we cannot adhere tenaciously to all our own rules and customs, if we are to build up out of the varied elements of Indian Christianity a United Indian Church. Our Lord Himself, in relation to the Sabbath, laid down the great principle:—'The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath.' The rules and traditions and laws of the Church exist for the well-being of the Church. If the Church is to be a free living organism, able to adapt itself to a new life in the future, we must combine loyalty to our historic past and the traditions that we have inherited with the freedom of the gospel of Christ.

A UNITED CATHOLIC CHURCH

I have tried to sum up certain main principles which the unity and well-being of the Christian Church demand. We must believe in and desire a United Catholic Church. In that Church we must be loyal to the past and to the great principles we have inherited, but our loyalty must be joined to a sense of freedom and the realization that what is inherited from the past will not be adapted to the future, unless it is harmonized with the new ideas and circumstances. I would now end by making to you a great practical appeal. We cannot to-day forget that this is the first time that the Church Congress has met within the limits of the new Province of Wales. Many changes have taken place within the Principality of Wales since last the Church Congress met here. I need not go back on old controversies. Some may regret what has happened; many, I believe, not only acquiesce but acquiesce willingly in the changes that have taken place. At any rate, the disestablishment of the Church of Wales leaves it with an elasticity and freedom which it has not possessed for many hundreds of years. It can work out its own fate. The Welsh Church is one which has a longer history than the Church of England. It has traditions which go back to the earliest ages of Christianity in Britain. The Welsh people have ever been well-known for the fervency of their religious aspirations. Surely the task that lies before your Church is the building up for the people of Wales of one united Church which may adequately and completely bring all the riches of your national life to the cause of Christ.

I have heard it said that you must wait and see what the Church of England is going to do. Surely that is a mistake. It is easier for you to act and for you to take the lead. Just as the Indian Christians of South India have found themselves far freer to work for Christian unity because they are less bound by the traditions of the past, so I believe the work of building up a United Welsh Christianity will be easier for a Church which, whatever it may have lost, has gained full freedom of action. The first meeting of the Church Congress in the newly organized Welsh Church must mean our hope and our desire to strengthen you in your new life, and I would very earnestly suggest to you that the opportunity and duty is now given you of starting to remedy the dissensions which the last 150 years have introduced into your Welsh religious life—of attempting to build up once more a Church like that of old times in which, not only in name but in reality, you could represent the whole people of Wales, in which you could give to Christianity all that the Welsh genius can contribute, and give to your people the guiding discipline of historical Christianity.